

REMARKS

Claims 1-6, 14 and 17 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1, 3 and 14 are amended, and claims 7 and 18 are canceled without prejudice or disclaimer.

Reconsideration based on the amendments and remarks is respectfully requested.

I. Allowable Subject Matter

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the indication that claim 16 is allowable.

II. Objection to Form

The Office Action rejects to claims 7 and 18 under 37 C.F.R. 1.75(c) as being of improper dependent form for allegedly failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. By this Amendment, Applicant cancels claims 7 and 18 thus obviating the objection.

Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

III. The Claims Particularly Point Out and Distinctly Claim the Subject Matter

The Office Action rejects claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Specifically, the Office Action asserts that claim 6 lacks antecedent basis in reciting "the electrode". Applicant respectfully submits that claim 6, as amended, obviates the rejection.

Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

IV. The Claims Define Allowable Subject Matter

The Office Action rejects claims 1-3, 7, and 14 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Cox et al. (U.S. 7,061,945). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Cox does not constitute "prior art". Specifically, Cox's earliest effective date of priority is May 13, 2003, while the priority date of the present application is March 19, 2003.

As such, Cox is not prior art. A verified English-language translation of the priority document is attached. Thus, this rejection is moot.

The Office Action rejects claims 1-2, 4-6 and 17-18 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Carey et al. (U.S. 6,277,696). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Office Action asserts that a member 326 of Carey is analogous to a block member, as recited in claim 1. However, the member 326 is an electrode as described in col. 4, line 46. Contrarily, the presently claimed combination of features has a block member separate from the electrode provided on the top of the laminate. The structure claimed in each independent claim is quite different from the structure taught by Carey. As such, Applicant submits that amended claims 1 and 14 are distinguishable over Carey.

Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

For the foregoing reasons, claims 1 and 14, as well as the claims dependent therefrom, are not anticipated by Cox and/or Carey.

V. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of the claim are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Linda M. Saltiel
Registration No. 51,122

JAO:LMS/sqb

Attachments:

Petition for Extension of Time
English translation of JP 2003-075443

Date: November 29, 2006

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
--